

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

II. Drawings

In the Office Action dated March 26, 2004, the drawings have been indicated as being acceptable.

III. Rejection of The Claims

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,243 to Nielsen (the "Nielsen reference"). For the below stated reason, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of the instant invention relates to an e-mail forwarding system in which a remote e-mail forwarding computer, separate and apart from a sender's and recipient's computer, is able to automatically associate forwarding e-mail addresses for e-mail that was undeliverable to a disfavored e-mail address. And just as important, the remote e-mail forwarding computer is able to forward the previous undeliverable e-mail to the associated e-mail forwarding address. With specific reference to claim 1, it is recited:

... sending the e-mail message from the remote computer to a computer associated with at least one forwarding address if there is determined at least one disfavored e-mail address associated with the intended e-mail address.

In rejecting claim 1 the examiner stated the Nielsen reference teaches this above recitation with references to Col. 4, line 57 to Col. 5, line 21 and Col. 5, line 58 to Col. 6, line 55 of the Nielsen reference.

It is submitted that the Nielsen reference does not actually teach the above-stated recitation of claim 1 but rather teaches sending an e-mail forwarding address back from a remote computer (i.e., ADDRESS-CHANGE SERVER 103) to the sender's computer (i.e., SENDER COMPUTER 101) whereby the sender's computer then inserts this forwarding e-mail address into a previous undeliverable e-mail message and the e-mail is then sent from the sender's

computer (and not from the remote computer) to an intended recipient (i.e., RECIPIENT COMPUTER 105). Specifically, the Nielsen reference explicitly states at Col. 5 lines 40-61:

After performing the steps described for determining whether the address-change server has an updated email address for the recipient, the address server returns either a message saying that no forwarding email could be found or it returns a message with the recipient's new email address (step 409) . . . *In the second case, the sender's email program constructs a new email message containing the content of the sender's original email message but addressed to the new email address of the recipient (step 415). The sender's email program transmits the new message to the recipient's new email address (step 417). (Emphasis added).*

Similarly, at Col. 2, line 65 to Col. 3, line 4, the Nielsen reference states:

The address-change server sends a reply email to the sender with the recipient's updated email address using the information stored in the database. The sender identifies the recipient's updated email address, creates a new email message, inserts the recipient's updated email address into the "To" line of the new message, and sends the new message to the recipient.

Since the Nielsen reference does not teach of forwarding an email message from a remote computer to a "computer associated with at least one forwarding address", but rather specifically teaches otherwise (that is, sending email forwarding information from a remote computer back to a sender's computer so the sender's computer can then forward the email message to a recipient), it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, and it's depending claims (i.e., 2-6) patentably distinguish from the Nielsen reference. Accordingly, withdrawal of the subject 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 1-6 is warranted.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-6 are now in a condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is

requested. If the Examiner should have any questions, he is kindly urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Capelli
Reg. No. 38,405
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3849

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000

(10020077.1) 4